UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/531,101 | 04/11/2005 | Janne Aaltonen | 006559.00006 | 2158 |
| 22907 BANNER & W | 7590 03/16/201 TTCOFF, LTD. | EXAMINER | | |
| 1100 13th STR | | PHUNG, LUAT | | |
| SUITE 1200 WASHINGTO | N, DC 20005-4051 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2464 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/16/2010 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/531,101 | ALTONEN, JANNE | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| LUAT PHUNG | 2464 | | |

| | LUAT PHUNG | 2464 | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appear | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>04 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS API | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | ALLOWANCE. | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidaviral (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | |
| a) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejectio | n. | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sloset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c | nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ver form for appeal by materially reconstructions or repeated by materially rejectors. | E below); ducing or simplifying th | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.114. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed the second of the second | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Col | | , | | | |
| non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | l be entered and an ex | xplanation of | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overshowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a | | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowand | ce because: | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other: | | | | | | |
| /Ricky Ngo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2464 | /Luat Phung/ Examiner, Art Unit 2464 | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment, which amends independent claims 17 and 23, inter alia, cites limitations that have not been previously presented ("a data transfer rate experienced by the host increases as further hosts are included in the goup through sharing of bandwidth allocated to the host and the further hosts on a network on which the first file delivery transmission occurs" added into claim 17, and similar limitation added to claim 23) and now alters the scope of the claims; this new issue will require further search and reconsideration.

In response to Applicant's argument that Virgile does not suggest the sharing of bandwidth or the dependence of data transfer rate on group membership, it is noted that Virgile discloses wherein each host in the group is allocated an amount of bandwidth on a network on which the first file delivery transmission occurs (abstract; transmitting packets to hosts belonging to a multicast group/subnetwork/segment [as each host in the group in a network on which transmission occurs], each host inherently having been allocated resources or bandwidth to receive multicast packets), and sharing allocated bandwidth of multiple hosts in the group (col. 6, lines 1+; transmitting multicast message to multicast group, i.e., hosts in the multicast group having common resources [as sharing bandwidth] to receive multicast message) to increase a data transfer rate experienced by the hosts in the group (col. 5, lines 23+; preventing hosts outside of the group from originating or receiving multicast traffic, causing performance degradation; col. 6, lines 1+; conserving bandwidth; it would have been obvious to a skilled partisan that prevention of performance degradation and bandwidth conservation result in having more bandwidth available for communication, and accordingly having increased data transfer rate).